

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
September 22, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group (LUWG) on September 22, 2003 in Sacramento.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Land Use Resource Action Matrix (Revised)

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the LUWG meeting, including several people who participated via videoconference. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The LUWG reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – August 25, 2003 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the August 25, 2003 LUWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

**Action Item #LU67:** Report back to the LUWG regarding DWR's research into the fuel load liability issue (carry-over action item).

Status: Laurence Kerckhoff (DWR) reported back to the Work Group regarding the fuel load liability issue. He indicated that DWR legal staff has researched the issue, but all information is internal to DWR at this point in time due to potential sensitivities surrounding this issue.

Jim Martin (DWR) noted that there is generally a high density of fires in the Oroville region. He also indicated that DWR has met with Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) representatives on certain issues pertaining to fuel load liability. DPR may be more sensitive to this issue because there is a higher probability of fire occurrences associated with recreational activities (e.g., campfires, lanterns, etc.). There is a proposed resource action that includes development of a fuel load management plan. He added that SP-L5 does not include a management plan, but provides an existing conditions report and evaluation of several options that can be utilized in the development of such a plan. An issue was raised concerning the risk of impact to the local watershed that could result from a catastrophic fire in the region; it was suggested that this issue receive further evaluation however it was noted that this is an issue that requires coordination with numerous agencies and entities with land management responsibilities in the watershed. DPR clarified that their major concern relates to the public (wildland) and private land interface, which is the issue addressed by resource action LWG-19. One participant suggested coordination with the Quincy Library Group and local fire councils on this topic; these

entities, along with CDF, have been contacted during the preparation of SP-L5 and feedback is expected from CDF on that study.

- Action Item #LU74:** Research discrepancies in the land use mapping and report back to the LUWG.  
Status: This action items was discussed in the context of the study implementation update for SP-L1. At the previous LUWG meeting, it was noted that land uses classified as “Residential” and “Rural Residential” in the land use mapping were located within the FERC project boundary, which is purported to consist of only public lands. Steve Pavich (EDAW) researched this issue further with Gail Kuenster (DWR) who prepared the vegetation mapping for the project and indicated that these discrepancies are, for the most part, a result of mapping anomalies in the GIS associated with an imprecise FERC boundary data layer. These mapping anomalies will be noted in the study report.
- Action Item #LU75:** Transmit list of approved development projects in the study area to the PDEA Team as they are identified.  
Status: A list of development projects “on record” with the city and county planning departments has been assembled for the purposes of SP-L1. This list will be provided to the PDEA Team for its consideration in the cumulative impact analysis. The project list will be augmented as new projects are identified.
- Action Item #LU76:** Forward RA LWG-1 to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for evaluation.  
Status: RA LWG-1 has been forwarded to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group.
- Action Item #LU77:** Prepare Resource Action Information Form for LWG-16.  
Status: Woody Elliot (DPR) prepared a Resource Action Information Form for LWG-16, which addresses grazing issues in the project area.
- Action Item #LU78:** Coordinate with the Oroville Field Division to identify the specific locations of dump areas referenced in LWG-3.  
Status: Jim Martin (DWR) has been coordinating with the Oroville Field Division (OFD) on this issue. OFD will prepare a map and a description of existing dump areas for reference in LWG-3. This information will support the RA form for LWG-3.

## **Review of Work Group and Plenary Group Meetings**

The Facilitator informed the LUWG that the Plenary Group is expecting an update and presentation over the next several months from each of the work groups regarding proposed resource actions that are being recommended for further consideration in the relicensing process.

## **Study Implementation Update**

The Consultant Team provided an update on all five Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics study plans to the LUWG. Large-format maps produced for studies SP-L1 and SP-L2 were available for review at the meeting.

### **SP-L1 (Land Use)**

Steve Pavich (EDAW) provided an update on SP-L1. He began by following up on Action Item LU-74, where he explained data anomalies in the land use mapping. Other revisions to the land use mapping included the implementation of a new land use category – “Resource Extraction”. Lands classified as “Resource Extraction” are intended to represent lands within the study area that are used for timber extraction, primarily by the U.S. Forest Service. At this point, both the land use and land ownership maps that have been developed as part of SP-L1 are considered to be in “draft-final” form subject to agency review. The next step is to submit the maps to various agencies that own and/or manage land in the study area for review, and incorporate any comments into the

mapping and associated text. The goal is to have a draft interim report for SP-L1 available for LUWG review by November 2003.

### ***SP-L2 (Land Management)***

Mark Greenig (EDAW) provided the update on the remainder of the Land Use studies, including SP-L2. This study evaluates who and how lands are managed in the study area. Data for this study were obtained from a range of sources, including Butte County, City of Oroville, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), DWR, DPR, and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Maps that address management prescriptions for each of these agencies will be included in the report. In addition, two compilation maps were developed that integrate all of the data acquired to provide a comprehensive view of land management patterns in the study area. These compilation maps, which depict managing entities and management prescriptions, were available at the meeting for review. Similar to SP-L1, the goal is to have a draft interim report for SP-L2 available for LUWG review by November 2003.

One participant noted that Butte County is in the process of updating its general plan. However, the process is not expected to be complete for approximately 1 ½ - 2 years; therefore, this information cannot be incorporated into the studies at this point in time, but can be integrated once that process is complete and future management direction of the County, including land use maps, are finalized.

One participant indicated the need for a law enforcement “plan” due to confusion regarding who is responsible for enforcement on different portions of the project area. This concern should be coordinated with the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) and utilize information developed during the evaluation of management activities within the project boundary. Jim Martin suggested that he would forward the issue to the RSWG for consideration. In addition, it was noted that Butte County has submitted a proposed resource action for the establishment of a Lake Oroville Oversight Committee to deal with the management of recreation facilities. This proposed resource action will be included in the Land Use resource action matrix, as well as evaluated in the RSWG (there may be opportunities to consolidate the two resource actions). It was noted that recreation-related management is being evaluated in one the recreation studies.

### ***SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency)***

The draft interim report for SP-L3 had been previously distributed to the LUWG for review. New plans can be included for consideration as appropriate. Ultimately, this study will be used as the basis for evaluating proposed resource actions for consistency with applicable plans.

### ***SP-L4 (Aesthetics)***

The draft interim report for SP-L4 will be submitted to DWR next month, with distribution to the LUWG expected in November/December 2003.

### ***SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management)***

The interim report for SP-L5 has been prepared and reviewed by DWR and the LUWG. The consultant team is awaiting comments from CDF review.

## **Potential Resource Action Development – Draft Matrix**

A revised Resource Action matrix for the LUWG was distributed to participants (see Attachment 4). It includes the edits provided at the previous LUWG meeting and provided by Mark Greenig (EDAW), but does not include the new resource action proposals submitted to DWR subsequent to last month’s meeting. Because the goal is to move resource actions from the work groups to the PDEA Team as soon as possible, there is the need to confirm the resource actions on the list and identify those that do not have Resource Action Identification Forms prepared for them. Rob MacKenzie (Butte County) indicated that he would review the matrix and check it against the

County's resource action list for consistency. It was clarified that it is not always feasible to track the resource action proponents but in general, individuals, DWR, and the consultant team have completed resource action forms.

The LUWG reviewed each of the individual resource actions in the matrix making revisions as necessary, and noting if a resource action form has been completed for it. A resource action form has been developed by EDAW for LWG-3; however, specific information regarding the location of dump facilities is still necessary. Jim Martin (DWR) will follow-up with the OFD to get this information. LWG-1 was transferred to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group; therefore, no resource action form has been developed. A resource action form has been completed for the landscaping component of LWG-2A. It was suggested LWG-2A should be separated into two proposals – one for landscaping and the other for wildlands, which would need further coordination with the Environmental Work Group. One participant suggested that the landscaping component of LWG-2A address landscaping along the face of the dam. LWG-2B does not have a completed resource action form because it was considered a Category 4 (“not recommended for further analysis”) proposal due to the fact that it was perceived to focus on lands outside the project boundary. However, it was concluded that LWG-2B really was intended to provide open space and/or buffers for projects within the project area to minimize impacts to areas outside the project area; EDAW will prepare a resource action form for this proposal.

No form has been developed for LWG-4; EDAW will prepare the form subject to DPR review. DPR has prepared a preliminary resource action form for LWG-19, which will be reviewed and expanded by EDAW as necessary. Andy Atkinson (CDFG) will follow-up on LWG-7, as no resource action form has been submitted by CDF. The development of a resource action form for LWG-8 is in progress. A resource action form has been developed by DPR for LWG-16, and forms have also been completed for LWG-17 and LWG-18. No form has been developed for LWG-20, which proposes additional CDFG funding as it will require coordination between the various work groups; Jim Upholt (DWR) will follow-up with the other work groups on this proposal. The remaining resource actions on the matrix (i.e., LWG-5, LWG-6, LWG-9, and LWG-10) have been classified as Category 4 proposals; therefore, no forms have been completed for them.

Several additional resource actions have been provided to the LUWG from the Plenary Group with accompanying resource action forms. These potential resource actions need to be added to the Land Use resource action matrix.

The next step is to recommend a set of Land Use resource actions to the Plenary Group and then move them forward to the PDEA Team. The LUWG discussed if they should review the individual resource action forms prior to submittal to the PDEA Team. It was decided that comments on the resource action forms should be provided during further discussion of the proposed resource actions at the next LUWG meeting.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

The next Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting will be:

Date: Monday, October 27, 2003  
Time: 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM  
Location: The Depot, Oroville

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the LUWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

- Action Item #LU78:** Coordinate with the Oroville Field Division to identify the specific locations of dump areas referenced in LWG-3 (*carry-over action item*).
- Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 27, 2003
- Action Item #LU79:** Transmit the land use, land ownership, and land management maps to applicable agencies for review.
- Responsible:** Consultant Team  
**Due Date:** October 27, 2003
- Action Item #LU80:** Review the Land Use resource action matrix against Butte County's resource action list for consistency.
- Responsible:** Rob MacKenzie  
**Due Date:** October 27, 2003
- Action Item #LU81:** Revise the Land Use resource action matrix and develop resource action forms based on input provided at the September LUWG meeting. Specific items include: (1) add resource action related to the development of a Lake Oroville Oversight Committee; (2) prepare a resource action form for LWG-2B; (3) prepare a resource action form for LWG-4; (4) review and expand as necessary the resource action form for LWG-19 that has been prepared by DPR; (5) follow-up with CDF on LWG-7; (6) coordinate with the other work group regarding LWG-20; and (7) add additional resource actions that have been provided by others to the resource action matrix.
- Responsible:** DWR / Consultant Team  
**Due Date:** October 27, 2003